

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were pending in the application. Claims 3, 9, and 20 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 10, and 13 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4-8, and 10-19 are now pending in the application.

The drawings were objected as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5). Applicant has amended the specification to overcome this objection.

The abstract of the disclosure was objected to because it is longer than 150 words. Applicant has amended the specification to overcome this objection.

Claims 3 and 20 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant has cancelled claims 3 and 20 to overcome this objection.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements. Applicant has amended claim 1 to overcome this rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103 Rejections

Claims 1-9 and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cyr et al. (U.S. Application No. 2003/0177211). Claims 10-13 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cyr in view of Saeki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,581,787).

Applicant respectfully submits that Cyr fails to teach or suggest, “wherein, when an FRU is connected to said FRU slot, said central resource is configured to retrieve said client-ID and provide said client-ID to said FRU, wherein said FRU is configured to download said client-ID via said bus” as recited by claim 1.

On page 7 of the pending Office Action, the Examiner admits that Cyr fails to teach the above-highlighted features of claim 1. However, the Examiner argues that Saeki teaches these features at column 4, lines 58-67 and column 5, lines 11-14. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Saeki teaches, at column 4, lines 58-67 and column 5, lines 6-14,

Each of the slots 14-17 has terminals a, b which are provided for electrical interconnection with an adapter. Each terminal is coupled to either high or low potential levels which are accomplished by connecting the terminal to +5 volts via a resistor or grounding the terminal in this example shown in FIG. 2. The combination of the **two potential levels** produces four unique and distinguishable numbers #0-#3 which are assigned to the slots 14-17 respectively. The combination of the two potential levels is used as a slot ID signal. (Emphasis added) (Saeki, column 4, lines 58-67)

Adapter 1 is connected via the slot 2 to address, data and control buses 3, 4, and 5 of the information processing apparatus. The adapter 1 comprises address allocator 6, comparator 7, decoder 8, I/O controller 9, adapter I/D generator 10, output gate 11 and blocks (not shown) necessary for accomplishing the functions of the adapter 1. The address allocator 6 generates allocation address data 100 in response to the slot ID signal of the slot on which the adapter 1 is mounted. (Saeki, column 5, lines 6-14)

While Saeki teaches two potential levels producing a slot ID signal and the address allocator generating the allocation address data based on the slot ID signal, Saeki fails to teach or suggest “wherein said **central resource** is configured to generate a client-ID” and “wherein, when an FRU is connected to said FRU slot, said **central resource** is configured to retrieve said client-ID and provide said client-ID to said FRU, wherein said FRU is configured to download said client-ID via said bus” as recited by claim 1.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 is believed to patentably distinguish over Cyr and Saeki, whether alone or combined. Claims 2, 4-8, and 10-15 are dependent upon claim 1 and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over the cited reference for at least the same reasons.

Likewise, independent claim 16 recites features similar to those highlighted above with regard to independent claim 1, and is therefore believed to patentably distinguish over the cited reference for at least the reasons given in the above paragraphs discussing claim 1. Claims 17-19 are dependent upon claim 16 and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over the cited reference for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If a phone interview would speed allowance of any pending claims, such is requested at the Examiner's convenience.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/6000-10001/BNK.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario J. Lewin
Reg. No. 54,268
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: 12/19/05